



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

15437-0539

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on

7/19/06

Signature

*Annette Valdivia*Typed or printed
name

Annette Valdivia

Application Number

09/885,633

Filed

6/19/2001

First Named Inventor

Christopher H. Elving

Art Unit

2145

Examiner

Bhatia, Ajay M.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☒

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 50,266

☐

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

Christian A. Nicholes

Signature

Christian A. Nicholes

Typed or printed name

408.4141080

Telephone number

July 19, 2006

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☐

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



REMARKS

As will be seen from the discussion below, there are clear errors of fact in the Examiner's rejections.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, "queueing the first request within a connection queue," where the first request is "for accesses to first content that is associated with a **first web site domain**." Claim 25 also recites, "queueing the second request within the connection queue," where the second request is "for access to second content that is associated with a **second web site domain**." Thus, Claim 25 requires a connection queue that contains requests for access to content from **different web site domains** ("wherein the second web site domain is separate from the first web site domain").

The Examiner alleges that a connection queue that contains requests for content from different web site domains is disclosed in some combination of the Background of the present application ("the Background"), U.S. Patent No. 6,493,837 ("Pang"), and "Java Network Programming, 2nd Edition" by Harold ("Harold").

The Background says nothing about a connection queue. A quick glance at FIGs. 1A and 1B, referenced in the Background, reveals that connection queue 208 of FIG. 2A is **conspicuously missing**. Clearly, since the system described in the Background only allows requests for content from a particular web site domain to be stored in a buffer **dedicated solely** to that particular web site domain, there would be no need for any queueing, within the **same** connection queue, of requests for access to content from **different** web site domains. Therefore, the Background says nothing about a connection queue into which requests for access to content associated with **different** web site domains are queued.

Harold and Pang also say nothing about a connection queue into which requests for access to content associated with **different** web site domains are queued. Pang mentions buffer lists 220 and 224, which the Examiner might analogize to the "connection queue" of Claim 25, but Pang never teaches or suggests that either of these buffer lists contain requests for access to content associated with **different** web site domains. The Examiner does not cite any specific portion of Harold.

Claim 25 also recites, “in response to being assigned a task of servicing the first request, the first server thread **determining to which web site domain of the plurality of web site domains the first request is related.**” This is clearly not disclosed in the Background. Server threads 160-166, discussed in the Background, have absolutely **no need** to make such a determination, since each server thread is **dedicated solely to one web site domain**. On page 4, lines 17-19, the Background says, “each server thread . . . executes in a separate memory address space and **services access requests for only a single web site domain.**” In addition, the Background actually says, on page 3, lines 13-16, “if any of the buffers become full, the contents of the buffer may be stored to a single file . . . **without having to determine which web site domain was associated with the request.**” Therefore, the Background says nothing about a server thread **determining to which web site domain of a plurality of web site domains a request is related.**

Harold and Pang also say nothing about a server thread **determining to which web site domain of a plurality of web site domains a request is related.** Pang mentions Microsoft Internet Information Server in passing, but Pang does not indicate that this server or any server thread ever determines to which web site domain of a plurality of web site domains a request is related. The Examiner does not cite any specific portion of Harold.

Claim 25 also recites, “the first server thread **loading first configuration data for the first web site domain** in response to determining that the first request is related to the first web site domain, wherein, **by loading the first configuration data,** the first server thread is **temporarily configured** as a server thread that is dedicated to servicing requests for content that is available within the first web site domain.” As is discussed above, the Background makes it clear that server threads 160-166 are **permanently dedicated** to separate web site domains. Therefore, there is no need for any of threads 160-166 to load configuration data that causes any of threads 160-166 to be **temporarily configured** as a server thread that services requests for a particular web site domain. The Background says absolutely nothing about threads loading configuration data or being temporarily configured. Therefore, the Background says nothing about a server thread **loading configuration data for a web site domain to temporarily configure** a first server thread as a server thread that is dedicated to servicing requests for content that is available within that web site domain.

Harold and Pang also say nothing about a server thread **loading configuration data for a web site domain to temporarily configure** a first server thread as a server thread that is dedicated to servicing requests for content that is available within that web site domain. Pang mentions Microsoft Internet Information Server in passing, but Pang does not indicate that this server or any server thread is ever temporarily configured, through the loading of configuration data for a specific web site domain, as a server thread that is dedicated to servicing requests for content that are available within that specific web site domain. The Examiner does not cite any specific portion of Harold.

Claim 25 also recites, “the first server thread **selecting, from among a plurality of buffer files, a first buffer file,**” and “the first server thread **selecting a first buffer from among a plurality of buffers in the first buffer file.**” Therefore, Claim 25 requires that a server thread first select a **buffer file**, and then select a buffer from among **a plurality of buffers within that selected buffer file**. The Background says nothing about (a) buffer files that comprise multiple buffers or (b) threads selecting such buffer files. Even if Pang discloses that a thread selects a log buffer from among a plurality of log buffers, Pang says nothing about a thread selecting a **buffer file** from among a plurality of buffer files, and then selecting the log buffer from among a plurality of log buffers within such a buffer file. The Examiner does not cite any specific portion of Harold as disclosing this feature.

Therefore, the Examiner makes a clear error of fact when the Examiner alleges that some combination of the Background, Pang, and Harold discloses, teaches, or suggests any of the features of Claim 25 discussed above.

Conclusion

By virtue of their dependence from Claim 25, Claims 26 and 27 inherit the features of Claim 25 that the combination of the Background, Pang, and Harold does not disclose, teach, or suggest.

Applicants request that the rejections of Claims 25-27 be reversed.